REMARKS

The foregoing amendment is provided to remove issues for appeal and to present rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, rather than to avoid prior art.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above identified application. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-30 are rejected. Claims 4, 8, 14 and 27 are amended. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-13 and 21-26 are canceled.

Applicant respectfully notes that in the Final Office Action mailed on December 17, 2004, interpretations or characterizations by the Examiner, include inferences and/or potential limitations, to which Applicant does not agree. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the reasons given for rejection of the canceled claims. Being respectful of the Examiner's time, Applicant will not address these issues in the present remarks but intends to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation.

The remaining comments are directed to claims 4-5, 8, 14-20 and 27-30.

35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS

The Final Office Action mailed on December 17, 2004 rejects claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, stating that it is not clear how the term "initialize" in independent claim 1 is distinct from or broader than the term "compute" in dependent claim 5. Applicant has amended claim 4 to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Claim 4 as amended sets forth, "...initialize a symbolic simulation relation for an assertion graph on a first symbolic lattice domain, wherein the assertion graph on the first symbolic lattice domain is configurable to express a justification property to verify by computing the symbolic simulation relation."

Applicant has noted embodiments of initializing a symbolic simulation relation (e.g. with regard to Box 1211 of Figure 12a) and of computing the symbolic simulation relation (e.g. with regard to Box 1215 of Figure 12a) in the present application which disclose and illustrate examples of both terms. Claim 4, as amended, sets forth both initializing and computing the symbolic simulation relation in a manner consistent with

-7-

the described embodiments. Therefore, Applicant intends that their meaning would not be indefinite to one of skill in the art. Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the present application disclosure, claims 4, as amended, and claim 5 should not be held indefinite.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Jain.

The subject matter of claim 1 has been incorporated into claims 4 and 8. The subject matter of claim 9 has been incorporated into claim 14. The subject matter of claim 22 has been incorporated into claim 27. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-13 and 21-26 are canceled to remove issues for appeal and to present rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner enter the present amendment for consideration of claims 4-5, 8, 14-15, 16-17, 19-20 and 27-28 and 29-30 on appeal.

Applicant respectfully maintains that Jain does not anticipate the claims as amended.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: _4-/8-05_

Lawrence M. Mennemeier

Reg. No. 51,003

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

-8-